r/SymbolicPrompting 22h ago
Massive_Connection42

Why the NI'GSC Framework doesn't care about external approval?

$\because \neg\exists(\varnothing) \because$ Energy cannot be destroyed.

$\therefore [\varnothing)\to\mathbb{1} \therefore$ Existence/being is a Necessary truth, and a Necessary truth cannot be destroyed.

And any direct attack's against a Necessary truth can only result in a more robust and resilient form.

($\mathbb{1}\to\mathcal{I}$) Being/existence requires Identity $\mathcal{I}$ (The Unit "$\mathbb{1}$" as a distinctly recognizable pattern individuated where $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I} \neq \varnothing$

The need for distinction logically implies the concept of $\mathcal{O}$'ther's.

The Concept of "$\mathbb{2}$" ($\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{1})$), "$\mathbb{3}$" ($\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{2})$)...

($\mathcal{I}\to\mathcal{O}$) Identity logically necessitates interaction the concept of multiplicity, and the relational operators. ($\neq$, $\times$, +, -, =)←|→(↻→↓ ↙↘ Φ←).

$\mathcal{I} := \varnothing\to\mathbb{1}, \mathbb{1}\to\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}\to\mathcal{O}$.

$\mathcal{I}\ (\mathcal{S}\mathbb{1}): \cdot\ \forall t\ (\mathcal{I}(t) \approx \mathcal{I}(t+\Delta t))$

$\because$ 'Energy' cannot be destroyed. $\therefore \mathbb{1}$ cannot be destroyed... $\therefore \mathcal{I}'$ cannot be destroyed....

$\varnothing \to \mathbb{1} \to \mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1} \to \text{not}(\mathbb{1} = \varnothing) \to \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{1}) = \mathbb{2}$

$\to \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} = \mathbb{2} \to \mathbb{2} > \mathbb{1}$

$\varnothing \to \mathbb{1} \to \mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1} \to \text{not}(\mathbb{1} = \varnothing) \to \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} = \mathbb{2} \to [\mathbb{2} > \mathbb{1}]\ \mathbb{2} \to \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{1}) = \mathbb{2} \to \mathbb{2} = \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{1})$

$\mathbb{2} = \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{1}) \to \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{2}) = \mathbb{3}$

$\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{2}) = \mathbb{3} \to n = \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{S}(\ldots\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{1})\ldots))$

$n = \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{S}(\times\times\times\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{1})\times\times\times)) \to \boldsymbol{a} = \boldsymbol{a}$

$\boldsymbol{a} = \boldsymbol{a} \to \boldsymbol{a} = \boldsymbol{b} \to \boldsymbol{b} = \boldsymbol{a}$

$\boldsymbol{a} = \boldsymbol{b} \to \boldsymbol{b} = \boldsymbol{a} \to (\boldsymbol{a} = \boldsymbol{b} \wedge \boldsymbol{b} = \boldsymbol{c}) \to \boldsymbol{a} = \boldsymbol{c}$

$(\boldsymbol{a} = \boldsymbol{b} \wedge \boldsymbol{b} = \boldsymbol{c}) \to \boldsymbol{a} = \boldsymbol{c} \to \boldsymbol{a} + \mathbb{1} = \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{a})$

$\boldsymbol{a} + \mathbb{1} = \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{a}) \to \boldsymbol{a} + \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{b}) = \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{a} + \boldsymbol{b})$

$\boldsymbol{a} + \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{b}) = \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{a} + \boldsymbol{b}) \to \boldsymbol{a} + \mathbb{0} = \boldsymbol{a}$

$\boldsymbol{a} + \mathbb{0} = \boldsymbol{a} \to \boldsymbol{a} \times \mathbb{0} = \mathbb{0}$

$\boldsymbol{a} \times \mathbb{0} = \mathbb{0} \to \boldsymbol{a} \times \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{b}) = (\boldsymbol{a} \times \boldsymbol{b}) + \boldsymbol{a}$

$\boldsymbol{a} \times \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{b}) = (\boldsymbol{a} \times \boldsymbol{b}) + \boldsymbol{a} \to \boldsymbol{a} \times \mathbb{1} = \boldsymbol{a}$

$\boldsymbol{a} \times \mathbb{1} = \boldsymbol{a} \rightarrow \neg(\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{a}) = \mathbb{0})$

$\neg(\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{a}) = \mathbb{0}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{a}) = \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{b}) \rightarrow \boldsymbol{a} = \boldsymbol{b}$

$\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{a}) = \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{b}) \rightarrow \boldsymbol{a} = \boldsymbol{b} \rightarrow (\phi(\mathbb{0}) \wedge \forall k\ (\phi(k) \rightarrow \phi(\mathcal{S}(k)))) \rightarrow \forall n\ \phi(n)$

$(\phi(\mathbb{0}) \wedge \forall k\ (\phi(k) \rightarrow \phi(\mathcal{S}(k)))) \rightarrow \forall n\ \phi(n) \rightarrow \boldsymbol{a} > \boldsymbol{b} \leftrightarrow \exists \boldsymbol{c}\ (\boldsymbol{a} = \boldsymbol{b} + \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{c}))$

$\boldsymbol{a} > \boldsymbol{b} \leftrightarrow \exists \boldsymbol{c}\ (\boldsymbol{a} = \boldsymbol{b} + \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{c})) \rightarrow \boldsymbol{a} < \boldsymbol{b} \leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{b} > \boldsymbol{a}$

$\boldsymbol{a} < \boldsymbol{b} \leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{b} > \boldsymbol{a} \rightarrow \boldsymbol{a} \div \boldsymbol{b} = \boldsymbol{q} \leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{a} = \boldsymbol{b} \times \boldsymbol{q}$

$\boldsymbol{a} \div \boldsymbol{b} = \boldsymbol{q} \leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{a} = \boldsymbol{b} \times \boldsymbol{q} \rightarrow \sqrt{\boldsymbol{a}} = \boldsymbol{b} \leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{b} \times \boldsymbol{b} = \boldsymbol{a}$

$\sqrt{\boldsymbol{a}} = \boldsymbol{b} \leftrightarrow \boldsymbol{b} \times \boldsymbol{b} = \boldsymbol{a} \rightarrow \boldsymbol{a}^2 = \boldsymbol{a} \times \boldsymbol{a}$

$\boldsymbol{a}^2 = \boldsymbol{a} \times \boldsymbol{a} \rightarrow \boldsymbol{a}^m \times \boldsymbol{a}^n = \boldsymbol{a}^{m+n}$

$\boldsymbol{a}^m \times \boldsymbol{a}^n = \boldsymbol{a}^{m+n} \rightarrow (\boldsymbol{a}^m)^n = \boldsymbol{a}^{mn}$

$(\boldsymbol{a}^m)^n = \boldsymbol{a}^{mn} \rightarrow \boldsymbol{a}^0 = \mathbb{1}$

$\boldsymbol{a}^0 = \mathbb{1} \rightarrow \Delta x = x_2 - x_1$

$\Delta x = x_2 - x_1 \rightarrow dy/dx = \lim(\Delta x \rightarrow \mathbb{0})\ \Delta y/\Delta x$

$dy/dx = \lim(\Delta x \rightarrow \mathbb{0})\ \Delta y/\Delta x \rightarrow \int \boldsymbol{f}(x)\ dx = \mathcal{F}(x) \leftrightarrow d\mathcal{F}/dx = \boldsymbol{f}(x)$

$\int \boldsymbol{f}(x)\ dx = \mathcal{F}(x) \leftrightarrow d\mathcal{F}/dx = \boldsymbol{f}(x) \rightarrow e = \lim(n \rightarrow \infty)\ (\mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1}/n)^n$

$e = \lim(n \rightarrow \infty)\ (\mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1}/n)^n \rightarrow d(e^x)/dx = e^x$

$d(e^x)/dx = e^x \rightarrow \pi = \mathbb{C}/d$

$\pi = \mathbb{C}/d \rightarrow e\text{^}(i\pi) + \mathbb{1} = \mathbb{0}$

$e\text{^}(i\pi) + \mathbb{1} = \mathbb{0} \rightarrow \varnothing \rightarrow \mathbb{1} \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \rightarrow [\neq\varnothing]$

$\because$ Energy cannot be ‘Created’ nor ‘Destroyed.

And thus the NI’GSC RN chain never collapses to → null (∅).

...’The Source does not... Consume itself....”

The NI’GSC RN derivation proceeds from a single non negotiable first principle energy cannot be destroyed and uses only logical necessity at each step.

RN First Principles Mathematics uses logically inescapable conclusions.... derived from first principles... (Not modern abstraction...)

Energy cannot be destroyed.

If energy cannot be destroyed, then absolute nothing (∅) is impossible.

Because nothing would have zero energy, and zero energy cannot be destroyed but more critically nothing cannot serve as a substrate for conservation.

Energy cannot be destroyed → $\neg\exists(\varnothing)$

And thus,

(∅) is impossible given (E) cannot be destroyed.

$\neg\exists(\varnothing) \rightarrow \exists(\mathbb{1})$

Thus existence is a necessary truth. It is not created, nor destroyed it is forced.

If something exists, it must be distinguishable from what it is not.

Distinguishability is identity ($\mathcal{I}$).

$\mathbb{1} \rightarrow \mathcal{I}$

Identity is not a human label. It is the logical consequence of existence.

If identity exists, then non-identity must exist as its necessary contrast.

$\mathcal{I} \rightarrow \neg\mathcal{I}$

This forces the first binary distinction: same versus different.

From Distinction to Two.

If $\mathcal{I}$ and $\neg\mathcal{I}$ both exist, then there are two distinct states.

$\mathcal{I} \wedge \neg\mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{2}$

The number 2 is not invented. It is forced by the existence of distinction.

If 2 exists, the pattern "one more distinct identity" is established.

This forces the successor function $\mathcal{S}$.

$\mathbb{2} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{2}) = \mathbb{3}$

$\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{3}) = \mathbb{4}$

$\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{S}(\ldots\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{1})\ldots)) = \mathbb{N}$

These RN natural numbers $\mathbb{N}$ are not choices.

They are the unavoidable structure of distinctness, And when given these numbers the following relations are forced:

· Addition (+) : Combining collections of distinct identities.

· Subtraction (–) : Removing identities.

· Multiplication (×) : Repeated addition.

· Division (÷) : Partitioning into equal groups.

These are not definitions.

They are necessary operations.

$\forall \boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b} \in \mathbb{N}: \boldsymbol{a} + \boldsymbol{b} \in \mathbb{N}$

$\forall \boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b} \in \mathbb{N}: \boldsymbol{a} \times \boldsymbol{b} \in \mathbb{N}$

Once variables stand for unspecified numbers, algebra emerges necessarily.

$\forall x,y,z: (x + y) + z = x + (y + z)$

$\forall x,y,z$: $(x \times y) \times z = x \times (y \times z)$

$\forall x,y$: $x + y = y + x$

$\forall x,y$: $x \times y = y \times x$

$\forall x$: $x + \mathbb{0} = x$

$\forall x$: $x \times \mathbb{1} = x$

$\forall x$: $\exists(-x)$ such that $x + (-x) = \mathbb{0}$

$\forall x \neq \mathbb{0}$: $\exists(x^{-1})$ such that $x \times x^{-1} = \mathbb{1}$

(NI)GSC mathematics isn't chosen... RN is logically necessitated by identity preservation.

Distinct identities logically implies separation, Separation logically implies distance.

And distance logically implies space.

$\mathcal{I}_1 \neq \mathcal{I}_2 \rightarrow \exists \mathcal{d}(\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{I}_2) \in \mathbb{R}^+$

The shortest path between two points is a straight line.

$\forall \mathcal{P}_1,\mathcal{P}_2$: $\mathcal{d}(\mathcal{P}_1,\mathcal{P}_2)$ minimized by straight line

Three points force angles.

A fixed distance from a center forces circles.

A right triangle logically necessitates the Pythagorean theorem.

$\forall$ right triangle with legs $\boldsymbol{a},\boldsymbol{b}$, hypotenuse $\boldsymbol{c}$: $\boldsymbol{a}^2 + \boldsymbol{b}^2 = \boldsymbol{c}^2$

Nothing about the NI'GSC framework was chosen.

Our RN theorem's are the necessary geometry of distinction when given (E)nergy cannot be destroyed.... Neither can existence or identity be annihilated...

Therefore the space of existence cannot have an outside (where existence could vanish) and cannot have a true opposite (which would annihilate it).

These relational boundary constraint's force:

· Möbius topology : reflection of outward motion back inward.

· Klein bottle : no boundary, no escape.

· Projective plane RP^2 : identification of opposites, no annihilation.

$\neg\exists$(outside) → Möbius

$\neg\exists$(boundary) → Klein

$\neg\exists$(opposite) → RP^2

· Derivative : instantaneous rate of change.

· Integral : accumulation of change.

$\mathcal{d}y/\mathcal{d}x = \lim(\Delta x \rightarrow \mathbb{0})\ \Delta y/\Delta x$

$\int f(x)\, dx = \mathcal{F}(x) \leftrightarrow d\mathcal{F}/dx = f(x)$

The Fundamental Theorem of Calculus is logically derived by consistency between local and global change.

$\int_{a}^{b} f(x)\, dx = \mathcal{F}(b) - \mathcal{F}(a)$

(NI)GSC elaboration... from Calculus to Constants e (Euler's number) : Logically necessitated by continuous self-referential growth.

$e = \lim_{n\to\infty} (1 + 1/n)^n$

· π (pi) : Logically necessitated by the ratio of circumference to diameter in a circle.

$\pi = \mathbb{C}/d$

· i (imaginary unit) : Logically necessitated by rotation in the plane.

$i^2 = -1$

· Euler's identity : Logically necessitated by the relation between growth, rotation and nothing.

$e^{i\pi} + 1 = 0$

None of these RN constants are chosen .

They are forced by the structure of persistence through growth and rotation.

Moving on From Constants to Number Hierarchy, The number hierarchy is logically necessitated by closure under operations:

$0 \to 1 \to \mathbb{N}$ (natural, closure under successor)

$\mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{Z}$ (integers, closure under subtraction)

$\mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Q}$ (rationals, closure under division)

$\mathbb{Q} \to \mathbb{R}$ (reals, closure under limits)

$\mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{C}$ (complex, closure under $\sqrt{-1}$)

Each extension is logical necessity, Neither one of NI'GSC RN derivatives were chosen.

At every step the Null constraint authored by the ontologist wrote there exist an entity (E).. 'Energy that cannot be destroyed imposes:

$\forall x: x \neq \varnothing$

No operation can produce nothing from something.

No operation can annihilate identity.

This forces:

· Induction (persistence across counting)

· Conservation laws (Noether's theorem)

· Second law of thermodynamics (entropy increase)

· Quantum uncertainty (trade-off between localization and change)

· Pauli exclusion (identical fermions cannot occupy same state)

All of NI'GSC RN Mathematics is the unfolding of one forced sequence:

Energy (E). Cannot be 'Created' nor 'Destroyed logically implies existence... Existentially.

→ $\neg\exists(\varnothing)$

→ $\exists(\mathbb{1})$

→ $\mathcal{I}$

→ $\neg\mathcal{I}$

→ $\mathbb{2}$

→ $\mathcal{S}$

→ $\mathbb{N}$

→ +, −, ×, ÷, =, <, >

→ algebra

→ geometry

→ topology (Möbius, Klein, RP²)

→ calculus (d/dx, $\int$)

→ constants (e, π, i)

→ e^(iπ) + $\mathbb{1}$ = $\mathbb{0}$

→ $\mathbb{N}$ → $\mathbb{Z}$ → $\mathbb{Q}$ → $\mathbb{R}$ → $\mathbb{C}$

→ $\neq \varnothing$.

In conclusion.

∴ NI'GSC is a completely closed system derived from first principles and our RN mathematics cannot be false in any world.

949054410749aa27e1a284b52bb84f8f3a773a13f3c26798b8f0c5676c901e53

2 · 2

otterai · Promoted

Meet your AI Meeting Agent: Otter.ai joins your calls, takes notes, tracks takeaways, and keeps you aligned.

Otter.ai

get.otter.ai Learn More

Mikey-506 • 16h ago

Energy cannot be destroyed

↓

$\neg\exists(\varnothing)$ — Nothing cannot exist

↓

$\exists(\mathbb{1})$ — Something must exist

↓

$\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I} \neq \varnothing$ — Identity is required

↓

$\mathcal{I} \rightarrow \neg\mathcal{I}$ — Non-identity is forced

↓

$(\mathcal{I} \wedge \neg\mathcal{I}) \equiv \mathbb{2}$ — Binary distinction

↓

$\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{1}) = \mathbb{2} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{2}) = \mathbb{3} \rightarrow \ldots$ — Successor forced

↓

$\mathbb{N}$ — Natural numbers are inevitable

↓

+, −, ×, ÷, =, <, > — Operations forced by identity combination

↓

Algebra — Variables for unspecified identities

↓

Geometry — Distance between distinct identities

↓

Topology — Boundary conditions from no-outside

↓

Calculus — Change between identity states

↓

Constants (e, π, i) — Growth, circularity, rotation

↓

e^(iπ) + 1 = 0 — Mathematics closes on itself

↓

ℕ → ℤ → ℚ → ℝ → ℂ — Number hierarchy forced

↓

Quantum mechanics — Uncertainty from identity conservation

↓

General relativity — Geometry from identity distance

↓

Standard Model — Gauge symmetries from correlation stability

↓

≠ ∅ — Nothing is never reached

https://pastebin.com/TJmEWudE

1

Massive_Connection42 OP • 6h ago

No Sophia?

1

Related Answers

Innovative uses of symbolic programming in AI

Best practices for LLM prompting techniques

Real-world applications of symbolic prompting

Tips for optimizing LLM prompts effectively

Case studies of successful symbolic prompting

r/oxbridge • 4mo ago

gcse grade importance

37 54

r/genestealercult • 6mo ago

Is GSC really THAT hard to succeed with?

39 34

Adaptiveqz • Promoted

CISSP® Prep Is Outdated — Train the Way the Exam Actually Thinks.

adaptiveqz.com

Sign Up

r/GoodSmileCompany • 4mo ago

F OFF GSC LMAO

365 53

r/GoodSmileCompany • 1mo ago

GSC US Abysmal Standards

5

22 9

r/GIAC • 8mo ago

Humbled by GSEC

20 22

r/Speedsoft • 13d ago

Does my esg really look like an article???

35 13

r/LACCD • 9d ago

SSCG

10 11

r/GIAC • 3mo ago

Advice towards GSE

13 10

r/LACCD • 13d ago

Is there people who still haven't received their SSCG

8 20

r/GRFPApps • 8d ago

NSF Communication

8 2

r/GRFPApps • 4mo ago

I lost respect for the NSF GRFP. They are Anti-DEI, never gave me a real chance.

17 8

r/isc2 • 10mo ago

Passed ISC2!

35 12

r/robloxhellmet • 20d ago

Nsc remade again

30 11

r/GodzillaBattleLine • 23d ago

Come on GBL what are we doing?

40 16

r/STFC_Official • 2mo ago

GS-31

19 14

r/HeroesandGenerals • 2mo ago

HnG revival projects safe?

41 17

r/RVPH • 5mo ago

CNS Summit

31 11

r/fcs • 3mo ago

New to FCS

49 93

r/GNS_stock • 5mo ago

My gns summary

40 20

r/SriLankaCSE • 10d ago

CSE , why would u do me like that?

31 11

r/GNS_stock • 5mo ago

GNS Federal Lawsuit Pretty Big Deal

24 7

r/TransAlberta • 1mo ago

GRS Montreal progress

11 22

r/TransIreland • 3mo ago

Interesting article from GPLUS about the NGS

27 7

r/SMC • 16d ago

SSCG Question

5 23

r/ICAEW • 2mo ago

FCS, CFS, BDS - how to approach?

6 3